

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0533-02
Bill No.: HCS for HB Nos. 149 & 536
Subject: Business and Commerce; Corporations; Taxation and Revenue - Income;
Taxation and Revenue - Sales and Use; Entertainment, Sports and Amusement;
Parks and Recreation
Type: Original
Date: May 2, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal would gradually reduce corporate income tax rates and provide a gradual reduction in taxability of individual business income. In addition, this proposal would create a state and local sales and use tax exemption for fees paid to any place of recreation.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
General Revenue	(\$98,777,644)	(\$171,724,668)	(\$237,514,302)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund *	(\$98,777,644)	(\$171,724,668)	(\$237,514,302)

* Fully implemented (FY 2018) estimated net effect is (\$364,854,302)

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 18 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Conservation Commission	(\$1,281,558)	(\$1,537,870)	(\$1,537,870)
Parks, and Soil and Water	(\$1,025,247)	(\$1,230,296)	(\$1,230,296)
School District Trust	(\$10,252,468)	(\$12,302,962)	(\$12,302,962)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	(\$12,559,273)	(\$15,071,128)	(\$15,071,128)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
General Revenue	4 FTE	4 FTE	4 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	4 FTE	4 FTE	4 FTE

☒ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

☒ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Local Government	(\$25,631,171)	(\$30,757,405)	(\$30,757,405)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Section 143.013, RSMo - Personal Business Income Tax Deduction:

In response to similar language in HB 536 LR 0588-01, officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** noted the proposed change to this section would allow an individual to subtract from federal adjusted gross income the amounts of business income as defined to the extent included in federal adjusted gross income when determining the individual's Missouri adjusted gross income. The deduction would be phased in as follows.

From January 1, 2013 until January 1, 2014, 10% of business income;
from January 1, 2014 until January 1, 2015, 20% of business income;
from January 1, 2015 to January 1, 2016, 30% of business income;
from January 1, 2016 to January 1, 2017, 40% of business income; and
from January 1, 2017 and thereafter, 50% of business income.

Fiscal impact

DOR officials noted for calendar year 2011, Missouri individual income tax filers reported \$11.7 billion in business income on Schedule C, Schedule D, Schedule E, and Schedule F for their federal 1040 forms. DOR officials included the total reported income in the calculation although some portion of the \$11.7 billion reported income could have been earned outside the state of Missouri and thus, not have been taxable in Missouri. On the other hand, the \$11.7 billion does not include Missouri business income on a federal return filed by an individual that did not have a Missouri address.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Based on that \$11.7 billion in business income, and at the current tax rate of 6 percent, the Department estimated the following reduction in individual income tax:

2013	\$70.2 million
2014	\$140.4 million
2015	\$210.6 million
2016	\$280.8 million
2017	\$351.0 million

Administrative impact

DOR officials assumed the Department would need to make form changes, and the Department and ITSD-DOR would need to make programming changes to various tax systems.

In order to implement this proposal, DOR officials assumed Personal Tax would require two additional Temporary Tax Employees for key entry, one additional Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) per 19,000 additional errors, and one additional Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) per 2,400 pieces of correspondence.

Collections and Tax Assistance (CATA) would require one additional Tax Collection Technician I (Range 10, Step L) for every additional 15,000 contacts annually to the non-delinquent tax line, including one CARES phone and agent license, one additional Tax Collection Technician I (Range 10, Step L) for every additional 15,000 contacts annually to the delinquent tax line, including one CARES phone and agent license, and one additional Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) for every additional 4,800 contacts annually to the field offices with a CARES phone and agent license.

DOR officials did not provide separate estimates of the cost to implement the individual and corporate tax changes. Instead, DOR officials provided an estimate of the cost to implement the proposal in its entirety. That estimate included two additional temporary tax employees and seven additional FTE. The estimated cost, including salaries, benefits, equipment, and expense, totaled \$301,123 for FY 2014, \$302,032 for FY 2015, and \$305,199 for FY 2016.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes a substantial majority of individual tax filers would use tax preparation software or have their return prepared by a paid preparer. Accordingly, the number of calculation errors would be significantly reduced over previous years and the DOR estimate of additional FTE may be overstated. Therefore, Oversight assumes this proposal could be implemented with four additional FTE.

Oversight has, for fiscal note purposes only, changed the starting salary for the additional employees to correspond to the second step above minimum for comparable positions in the state's merit system pay grid. This decision reflects a study of actual starting salaries for new state employees and the policy of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research. Oversight has also adjusted the DOR estimate of equipment and expense in accordance with OA budget guidelines. Finally, Oversight assumes a limited number of additional employees could be accommodated in existing office space.

IT Impact

DOR officials did not provide separate estimates of the cost to implement the individual and corporate tax changes. Instead, DOR officials provided an estimate of the cost to implement the proposal in its entirety. The DOR estimate of the IT cost to implement this proposal was \$21,748 based on 804 hours of programming to make changes to DOR systems.

Oversight assumes OA - ITSD (DOR) is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes OA - ITSD (DOR) could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, OA - ITSD (DOR) could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Office of Administration, Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assumed similar language in HB 536 LR 0588-01 would phase in a deduction of business income from individual income tax, increasing from 10% in 2013, to 20% in 2014, to 30% in 2015, to 40% in 2016, and 50% thereafter. Business income would be defined as income greater than zero from the taxpayer's trade or business, and would include income from tangible property if the acquisition, management, and disposition of the property constitute integral parts of the taxpayer's regular trade or business operations.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

BAP officials did not have data that specifically identifies taxable business income as defined in the proposal. Based on information from the federal Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Statistics of Income estimates for Missouri, BAP officials estimated business income would exceed \$10.5 billion per year. At the highest (6%) marginal tax rate, the revenue reduction from the exclusion of 50% of business income from personal income tax could exceed \$315 million, notwithstanding any inflationary growth.

Oversight notes that the \$10.5 billion in business income referred to in the BAP comment includes only business and partnership income reported by the Internal Revenue Service. If Ordinary dividends, qualified dividends, and net capital gains would be considered business income subject to deduction under this proposal, the total business income subject to deduction and the revenue reduction resulting from this provision would be nearly twice as much.

Officials from the **University of Missouri, Economic and Policy Analysis Research Center (EPARC)** noted that this proposal would provide a “Business Income” subtraction.

EPARC officials estimated self - employment income by dividing each filer’s self - employment tax by the applicable tax rate. Using that methodology, EPARC estimated aggregate positive “business income” at \$7,229,010,965 for 312,226 Missouri filers. That amount of income was then gradually subtracted from filers’ federal AGI to arrive at their simulated Missouri AGI; a 10% subtraction for 2013, a 20% subtraction for 2014, a 30% subtraction for 2015, a 40% subtraction for 2016 and a 50% subtraction for 2017.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The impact of the personal income tax provisions is shown in this chart - amounts are in millions of dollars.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Individual Business Income Reduction</u>	<u>Individual Income Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Individual Income Tax Revenue Reduction</u>
Baseline	0%	\$4,693.390	\$0.000
2013	10%	\$4,663.934	\$29.456
2014	20%	\$4,635.522	\$57.868
2015	30%	\$4,608.141	\$85.249
2016	40%	\$4,582.100	\$111.290
2017	50%	\$4,557.582	\$135.808

Oversight will use the EPARC estimates in this fiscal note, and since revenues from income taxes are normally realized when returns are filed in the following state fiscal year, Oversight will include the fiscal impact for the provisions for 2013 in FY 2014, the provisions for 2014 provisions in FY 2015, and the provisions for 2015 provisions in FY 2016.

Oversight notes that there could be some reduction in estimated tax payments due to expected tax reductions if legislation is passed, but considers that potential impact to be negligible due to the timing of the legislative session and the uncertainty of final action by the Governor.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 143.071, RSMo. - Corporate Income Tax Rate:

In response to HB 536 LR 0588-01, officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** noted the proposal would change corporate income tax rates as follows.

Before January 1, 2013, 6.250% of taxable income;
from January 1, 2013 to January 1, 2014, 5.625% of taxable income;
from January 1, 2014 to January 1, 2015, 5.000% of taxable income;
from January 1, 2015 to January 1, 2016, 4.375% of taxable income;
and from January 1, 2017 and thereafter, 3.125% of taxable income.

DOR officials noted Missouri corporate taxpayers reported \$5.6 billion in taxable income and \$350 million in tax for 2010. Based on that estimated tax of \$350 million, the Department calculated the following reduction in corporate income tax.

2013	\$34 million
2014	\$70 million
2015	\$105 million
2016	\$140 million
2017	\$175 million

Administrative impact

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assumed the Department would need to make form changes, and the Department and ITSD-DOR would need to make programming changes to various tax systems.

Corporate tax would require one additional Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) per 7,800 additional errors generated, with CARES equipment and license, and one additional Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) per 2,600 additional pieces of correspondence generated, with CARES equipment and license.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DOR officials did not provide an estimate of the administrative impact for corporate and individual provisions separately. Instead, DOR officials provided an estimate of the cost to implement the entire proposal which included two additional temporary tax employees and seven additional FTE. That estimate, including salaries, benefits, equipment, and expense, totaled \$301,123 for FY 2014, \$302,032 for FY 2015, and \$305,199 for FY 2016.

Oversight assumes that virtually all corporate filers would have returns prepared by a paid preparer or corporate officer. Accordingly, the number of calculation errors would be significantly reduced over previous years and the DOR estimate of additional FTE may be overstated. Oversight assumes the corporate provisions could be implemented with existing resources.

IT Impact

DOR officials did not provide separate estimates of the cost to implement the individual and corporate tax changes. Instead, DOR officials provided an estimate of the cost to implement the proposal in its entirety. The DOR estimate of the IT cost to implement this proposal of \$21,748 based on 804 hours of programming to make changes to DOR systems.

Oversight assumes OA - ITSD (DOR) is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes OA - ITSD (DOR) could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, OA - ITSD (DOR) could request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar language in HB 536 LR 0588-01, officials from the **Office of Administration, Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** noted the proposal would reduce the corporate tax rate over three years, from 6.25% to 3.125%. In FY 2012, \$275.6 million in net corporate taxes was received. Notwithstanding any inflationary growth, this proposal would reduce general and total state revenues as in the chart below. Numbers are in millions of dollars.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Revenue Reduction</u>
FY 2013 (Baseline)	6.250%	\$275.6	\$0.0
FY 2014	5.625%	\$248.0	\$27.6
FY 2015	5.000%	\$220.5	\$55.1
FY 2016	4.375%	\$192.9	\$82.7
FY 2017	3.750%	\$165.4	\$110.2
FY 2018	3.125%	\$137.8	\$137.8

Officials from the **University of Missouri, Economic and Policy Analysis Research Center (EPARC)** noted this proposal would gradually reduce the corporate income tax rate from 6.25% in 2012 to 5.625% in 2013, to 5% in 2014, and to 4.375% in 2015, to 3.75% in 2016, and finally to 3.125% in 2017. The latest 2010 corporate income tax data indicates an aggregate liability of \$383.905 million. The impact of the corporate tax rate changes is shown in this chart. All amounts are in millions of dollars.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Corporate Income Tax Rate</u>	<u>Corporate Income Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Corporate Income Tax Revenue Reduction</u>
Baseline	6.250%	\$383.905	\$0.000
2013	5.625%	\$345.514	\$38.391
2014	5.000%	\$307.124	\$76.781
2015	4.375%	\$268.733	\$115.172
2016	3.750%	\$230.342	\$153.563
2017	3.125%	\$191.952	\$191.953

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight will use the EPARC estimates in this fiscal note, and since revenues from income taxes are normally realized when returns are filed in the following state fiscal year, Oversight will include the fiscal impact for the changes in 2013 provisions in FY 2014, the changes in 2014 provisions in FY 2015, and the changes in 2015 provisions in FY 2016.

Oversight notes that there could be some reduction in estimated tax payments due to expected tax reductions if legislation is passed, but considers that potential impact to be negligible due to the timing of the legislative session and uncertainty of final action by the Governor.

Section 144.020, RSMo. Sales Tax Exemption on Recreation Fees

Officials from the **Department of Conservation (MDC)** assume this proposal would exempt from state and local sales and use taxes the fees paid to places of recreation. MDC officials assume the provision would have an unknown negative fiscal impact greater than \$100,000 to the Department related to the removal of sales tax for recreation.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources** assumed a previous version of this proposal would result in a revenue reduction in excess of \$1 million per year for their organization.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assumed a previous version of this proposal would exempt amounts paid for admission, seating, accommodations, or fees paid to places of recreation from the state sales tax. Based on taxable sales figures from 2011, DOR officials estimated a reduction in sales tax revenue to the General Revenue Fund of approximately \$22.2 million and a reduction in Total State Revenue of \$31.2 million.

Administrative impact

DOR officials assumed Collections and Tax Assistance (CATA) would need to send letters to all "recreation" businesses to determine if they have sales that are still taxable. Also, CATA would see an increase in phone calls, file maintenance, and bond refunds based on this legislation.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DOR officials assumed CATA would require one additional FTE Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) per 24,000 additional contacts annually to the registration section, with CARES equipment and agent license; and one additional FTE Revenue Processing Technician I (Range 10, Step L) per 4,800 additional contacts annually to the tax assistance offices, with CARES equipment and agent license. In addition, the Legal Services Division would require one additional FTE Legal Counsel to cover additional sales tax litigation.

The DOR estimate of fiscal impact for this proposal included three additional employees; with benefits, equipment, and expense, the DOR estimate totaled \$147,618 for FY 214, \$159,096 for FY 2015, and \$160,736 for FY 2016.

Oversight notes that DOR officials assumed a similar proposal in a previous session (SB 288 LR 1587-01, 2011) would have no fiscal impact on their organization, and will not include any DOR costs in the fiscal impact for this proposal. Oversight assumes that notification costs to potentially exempt sellers would be provided in regular DOR communications to sales tax licensees.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials from the **City of Kansas City** assumed that exempting from local sales tax amounts paid for admission or fees to places of recreation would result in the following annual revenue losses to their organization, assuming an effective date for the legislation at the end of August, 2013:

Fiscal year ending April 30, 2014:	\$866,667 revenue loss (8 months loss)
Fiscal year ending April 30, 2015:	\$1,300,000 revenue loss
Fiscal year ending April 30, 2016:	\$1,300,000 revenue loss

Officials from **St. Louis County** assumed a previous version of this proposal would result in a small but unknown loss to their organization.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Administration, Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this proposal would not result in additional costs or savings to their organization.

BAP officials stated the proposal would create a state and local sales tax exemption for the amount paid for admission and seating accommodations, or fees paid to, or in, any place of recreation. BAP officials noted that "recreation" is not defined in statute.

BAP officials provided information from the Department of Revenue (DOR) for taxable sales from SIC Code 79, Amusement and Recreation Services, in 2011, and noted that sales taxes may be reduced by the amounts below. BAP officials noted that these sales may include sales of tangible goods, which would not be exempt under this proposal. Also, additional sellers not classified in SIC 79 could also be classified as "recreation", which would increase the revenue loss.

Reported Sales

SIC	DESCRIPTION	SALES TOTAL
791	DANCE HALLS, STUDIOS, AND SCHOOLS	\$4,936,920.82
792	PRODUCERS, ORCHESTRAS, ENTERTAINERS	\$54,026,838.31
793	BOWLING BILLARD ESTABLISHMENTS	\$72,623,115.43
794	COMMERCIAL SPORTS	\$339,909,520.89
798	RIVERBOATS - NO GAMBLING	\$124,954,004.45
799	MISC. AMUSEMENT AND RECREATION	\$633,845,781.00
79	AMUSEMENT/RECREATION SERVICES	<u>\$1,230,296,180.90</u>

Sales Tax Revenue

General Revenue Fund	\$36,908,885
School District Trust Fund	\$12,302,962
Conservation Commission Fund	\$1,537,870
Parks, and Soils and Water Fund	\$1,230,296

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight will use the BAP / DOR estimate of sales tax revenue and will assume that Local governments would have a revenue reduction of $(\$1,230,296,181 \times 2 \frac{1}{2} \% \text{ average rate}) = \$30,757,405$. Oversight calculated the $2 \frac{1}{2} \%$ average local sales tax rate based on DOR reported collections of local sales tax. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will include losses as follows:

	<u>FY 2014</u> (10 months)	<u>Full year</u>
General Revenue Fund	\$30,757,404	\$36,908,885
School District Trust Fund	\$10,252,468	\$12,302,962
Conservation Commission Fund	\$1,281,558	\$1,537,870
Parks, and Soil and Water Fund	\$1,025,247	\$1,230,296
Local governments	\$25,631,171	\$30,757,405

Bill as a whole responses

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the Secretary of State's Office for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, we also recognize that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what our office can sustain with our core budget. Therefore, we reserve the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume that this proposal would not have a fiscal impact to their organization in excess of existing resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **City of Columbia** stated they could not identify a direct fiscal impact for this proposal.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Cost - DOR</u>			
Personal income tax			
Section 143.013			
Salaries	(\$77,120)	(\$92,544)	(\$109,383)
Temporary employees	(\$13,000)	(\$15,756)	(\$15,914)
Benefits	(\$45,731)	(\$54,957)	(\$55,506)
Equipment and expense	<u>(\$37,389)</u>	<u>(\$3,526)</u>	<u>(\$3,614)</u>
Total	(\$173,240)	(\$166,783)	(\$184,417)
<u>FTE Increase - DOR</u>	4 FTE	4 FTE	4 FTE
<u>Revenue reduction - DOR</u>			
Individual business income deduction			
Section 143.013 *	(\$29,456,000)	(\$57,868,000)	(\$85,249,000)
* Fully implemented revenue reduction, 50% in FY 2018, is (\$135,808,000).			
<u>Revenue reduction - DOR</u>			
Corporate income tax rate reduction			
Section 143.071 *	(\$38,391,000)	(\$76,781,000)	(\$115,172,000)
* Fully implemented revenue reduction, to 3.125% in FY 2018, is (\$191,953,000).			
<u>Revenue reduction - DOR</u>			
Sales tax			
Section 144.020	<u>(\$30,757,404)</u>	<u>(\$36,908,885)</u>	<u>(\$36,908,885)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>(\$98,777,644)</u>	<u>(\$171,724,668)</u>	<u>(\$237,514,302)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Effect on General Revenue Fund	4 FTE	4 FTE	4 FTE

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government
 (continued)

FY 2014
 (10 Mo.)

FY 2015

FY 2016

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION
 FUND**

Revenue reduction - DOR

Sales tax exemption

Section 144.020

(\$1,281,558)

(\$1,537,870)

(\$1,537,870)

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON
 CONSERVATION COMMISSION
 FUND**

(\$1,281,558)

(\$1,537,870)

(\$1,537,870)

**PARKS, AND SOIL AND WATER
 FUNDS**

Revenue reduction - DOR

Sales tax exemption

Section 144.020

(\$1,025,247)

(\$1,230,296)

(\$1,230,296)

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON
 PARKS, AND SOIL AND WATER
 FUNDS**

(\$1,025,247)

(\$1,230,296)

(\$1,230,296)

SCHOOL DISTRICT TRUST FUND

Revenue reduction - DOR

Sales tax exemption

Section 144.020

(\$10,252,468)

(\$12,302,962)

(\$12,302,962)

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON
 SCHOOL DISTRICT TRUST FUND**

(\$10,252,468)

(\$12,302,962)

(\$12,302,962)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS			
<u>Revenue reduction - DOR</u>			
Sales tax exemption			
Section 144.020	<u>(\$25,631,171)</u>	<u>(\$30,757,405)</u>	<u>(\$30,757,405)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	<u>(\$25,631,171)</u>	<u>(\$30,757,405)</u>	<u>(\$30,757,405)</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

The corporate tax rate reduction in this proposal would have a direct fiscal impact to small businesses which are incorporated and pay taxes.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal would implement the Broad-Based Tax Relief Act of 2013, which would authorize reduced taxes on business income. The proposal would create an individual income tax deduction for business income, phased in over five years, and a reduction in the corporate income tax rate from 6.25% to 3.125% over five years. In addition, the proposal would create a state and local sales and use tax exemption for fees paid to any place of recreation.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of the Secretary of State
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning
Department of Conservation
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Revenue
University of Missouri
 Economic and Policy Analysis Research Center
St. Louis County
City of Columbia
City of Kansas City



Ross Strobe
Acting Director
May 2, 2013